

REMARKS

Prior to this Reply, Claims 1-31 were pending. Through this Reply, Claims 25 and 28 have been amended to correct obvious typographical errors. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1-31 are now at issue in the present case.

I. Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because the application lacked formal drawings.

In response, Applicants are submitting replacement Figs. 1, 2, 3 and 4 (contained on Replacement Sheets 1-2) to improve the quality of the drawings. Applicants note that Fig. 1 has been rotated clockwise 90 degrees and certain shading changes have been made. No new matter has been added. Figs. 1-4 constitute all of the drawings of the application.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 27 and 28 are in allowable form. Applicants have amended Claim 28 to correct an obvious typographical error. Applicants believe that Claims 27 and 28 are still in condition for allowance.

The Examiner objected to Claims 3, 5-9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19 and 23-26. However, the Examiner indicated that such claims would be allowable if they were written in independent form to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Instead of rewriting the objected-to claims in independent form, Applicants offer the argument presented below.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 13, 14, 16, 20-22 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,362 to Melrose et al. (hereinafter “Melrose”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of such claims.

In rejecting Claims 1, 4, 10, 16, 20, 22 and 29, the Examiner (citing Col. 2, lines 58-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-3 of Melrose) states that:

Melrose discloses a method comprising: providing a plurality of disk drives; and automatically determining an embedded runout correction ***threshold*** for each of the disk drives on a drive-by-drive basis. (emphasis added)

Applicants disagree. While Melrose does discuss how to cancel written-in repetitive runout in non-ideal tracks written on a disk surface of a disk drive, e.g., by determining embedded runout correction ***values*** (also known as compensation values, see, e.g., page 2, lines 15-18 of the present application), Applicants submit that there is no discussion whatsoever of determining an embedded runout correction ***threshold***, which is used to determine which tracks on the disk surface are to be corrected (see, e.g., p. 3, line 15 of the present application).

In one example of the prior art, which is discussed on page 3, lines 11-16 of the present application, an embedded runout correction threshold is set for all disk drives in a production run. In the example, the embedded runout correction threshold is used to determine which tracks are to be corrected in a particular production run of disk drives, since manufacturers desire to correct only the most poorly-written tracks for a production run of drives in an attempt to reduce manufacturing times. As described in the example discussed on p. 4, lines 1-5 of the present application, compensation values are determined for all of the servo sectors on a track. If the absolute value of the average PES_RRO for any servo sector in the track exceeds the ERC

threshold, the track is corrected. However, if the absolute value of the average PES_RRO for all servo sectors in the track are less than the threshold, the track is not corrected.

In view of the above, it is clear that an embedded runout correction *threshold* is different from an embedded runout correction *value*. Applicants submit that Melrose does not disclose an embedded runout correction threshold. Independent Claims 1, 4, 16, 22 and 29 all require “determining an embedded runout correction threshold” or “determining first and second embedded runout correction thresholds.” Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 4, 16, 22 and 29 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are patentably distinguishable from Melrose.

Although the comments above are believed to substantively distinguish the cited reference, Applicants do not necessarily accede to the assertions and statements in the Office Action, whether or not expressly addressed.


IV. Conclusion

Applicants believe that no additional fees are due. Nevertheless, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2198 for any fee deficiencies associated with filing this paper.

Applicants believe that the application appears to be in form for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number regarding any matters relating to the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Tejpal S. Hansra
Registration No. 38,172
Hansra Patent Services
4525 Glen Meadows Place
Bellingham, WA 98226
(360) 527-1400

Date: DEC. 15, 2004